

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

MAR 15 2010

Claims 41 to 48 are cancelled.


New claims 49 to 54 correspond to (now cancelled) claims 43 to 48, as follows.
New independent claim 49 is (now cancelled) claim 43 rewritten to include the claim dependencies of claim 42 and 41. New claims 50 to 54 depend on new claim 49 only. No changes have been made to the text of the (now cancelled) claims in their presentation in the new claims 49 to 54, except for a more detailed recitation of a Contextual Addressing Scheme message in new claim 49.

Applicant thanks Examiner for the telephone discussion of March 4, 2010.
Pursuant to that discussion, Applicant submits the new claims and requests allowance thereof. Applicant reiterates its explanation on the proper reading of **Carzaniga** (as set out in REMARKS / CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §102 in an Amendment filed August 31, 2009) and submits that **Carzaniga**, does not render new claim 49 (and dependent claims) unpatentable. Applicant believes that in their telephone discussion, Examiner agreed to this conclusion.

Amendments to the specification are to correct a typographical error ("Plus" to -- Plug-- in paragraph [0310]) and to make explicit an inferred term (--functional--) that is implicit in the second sentence of paragraph [0222] to echo the terminology in the sentence preceding it..

For Examiner's information, in new claim 51, the terms "custodial" and "inherits" are explained at paragraphs [0222] and following, and [0519] and following

Respectfully submitted,


Mark Yang
Agent Regn. No. 37,076

Patent application No. 10/763,918 Amendment Page 10